



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/595,288	06/15/2000	Erik P. Fiedorowicz	RSW9-2000-0041-US1	8794

7590 07/25/2005

Jeanine S Ray-Yarletts  
IBM Corporation T81/062  
Intellectual Property Law  
PO Box 12195  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER
----------

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/595,288

Applicant(s)

FIEDOROWICZ ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

48

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Appeal Brief filed 5/10/05 to the application filed 6/15/00.
2. Claims 1-45 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 16 and 31 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1-8, 14-24, 29-38, 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walsh have been withdrawn in view of Applicants arguments.
4. The rejections of claims 9, 31 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Walsh in view of Boag have been withdrawn in view of Applicants arguments.
5. The rejections of claims 10, 25, 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh and further in view of Feibus have been withdrawn in view of Applicants arguments.
6. The rejections of claims 11-13, 26-28, 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh and further in view of Boag have been withdrawn in view of Applicants arguments.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2178

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1, 9, 14, 16, 29, 31, 39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nielsen (US Pat No. 5,899,975, 5/4/99, filed 4/3/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Nielsen discloses:

- identifying a plurality of subset style sheets based on content of the electronic document (figure 7, #700-725: identifying the style sheets of the document)
- merging the plurality of subset style sheets to generate the composite style sheet (figure 7, #730, col 8, lines 1-15: the style sheets are combined in accordance with the rules)

Regarding independent claim 9, Nielsen discloses:

- identifying a plurality of subset style sheets based on content of the electronic document (figure 7, #700-725: identifying the style sheets of the document)
- merging the plurality of subset style sheets to generate the composite style sheet (figure 7, #730, col 8, lines 1-15: the style sheets are combined in accordance with the rules)
- determining if a composite style sheet for the electronic document is present in a composite style sheet repository and, if a composite style sheet for the electronic document is not present in the composite style sheet repository, performing the two steps identifying and merging above (figure 7, #720, #730)

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, Nielsen discloses identifying a plurality of subset style sheets based on characteristics of a client device to which the electronic document is to be sent (figure 7, col 5, lines 52-67).

Claims 16 and 29 are for an apparatus of method claims 1 and 14, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 31 and 44 are for a computer program product of method claims 1 and 14, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 31 and 39 are for a computer program product of method claim 9, and are rejected under the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2-7, 15, 17-23, 30, 32-37, 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen as applied to claims 1, 16 and 31 above, and further in view of Walsh, *The Extensible Style Language: {XSL} Styling XML Documents*, Web

Techniques, Jan 1999, vol. 4, iss. 1, pg. 49, 5 pgs, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-10).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Nielsen does not disclose that the plurality of subset style sheets includes a global style sheet and other subset style sheets, and wherein merging the plurality of subset style sheets includes inserting the other style sheets into the global style sheet to generate the composite style sheet.

Walsh discloses that the plurality of subset style sheets includes a global style sheet and other subset style sheets, and wherein merging the plurality of subset style sheets includes inserting the other style sheets into the global style sheet to generate the composite style sheet (**page 3**: the fact the XSL processor starts at *the root node* until the last child node to process the style sheet templates implies the plurality of style sheets includes a global style sheet, which is the style sheet at the root node of highest level, and other subset style sheets of the children nodes; **page 7**: copying each element in the template into the result tree until xsl:process-children is encountered shows inserting the other style sheets into the global style sheet of the document).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses inserting other style sheets into the global style sheet at the root node providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for easily combining the style sheets of the elements in a document.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Nielsen does not disclose inserting the other subset style sheets of the plurality of subset style sheets into the global style sheet includes converting a root template in each of the other subset style sheets to a child template.

Walsh discloses that inserting the other subset style sheets of the plurality of subset style sheets into the global style sheet includes converting a root template in each of the other subset style sheets to a child template (**page 7**: *“when xsl:process-children is encountered ... for each node, it finds the matching template and instantiates it. The sequence of instantiated templates is placed in the result tree at the location of the xsl:process-children element in the template; placing the sequence of said instantiated templates in the result tree inherently shows that the root template in the subset style sheets is converted to a child template since it was well known that a child node inherits the information from the root node, which is its ancestor*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses converting a root template in each of the other subset style sheets to a child template providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for easily merging the style sheets of the elements in a document using a template for the nodes in the structured document.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Nielsen does not disclose inserting the other subset style sheets of the plurality of subset style sheets into the global style

sheet further includes adjusting match phrases of embedded child templates and references in each of the other subset style sheets.

Walsh discloses inserting the other subset style sheets of the plurality of subset style sheets into the global style sheet further includes adjusting match phrases of embedded child templates and references in each of the other subset style sheets (**page 8**: “*The xsl: process instruction processes only selected children (or selected nodes from elsewhere in the tree). The xsl: process element has a required select attribute. All of the elements in the source tree that match the pattern specified in the select attribute are processed, and their instantiated templates are inserted into the result tree ...*”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses adjusting match phrases of embedded child templates and references in each of the other subset style sheets providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for having an effective way to insert the subset style sheets into the global style sheet.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2, Nielsen does not disclose that the other subset style sheets are inserted following a root template of the global style sheet. Walsh discloses that the other subset style sheets are inserted following a root template of the global style sheet (**page 7**: “*when xsl:process-children is encountered ... for each node, it finds the matching template and instantiates it. The sequence of instantiated templates is placed in the result tree at the location of the xsl:process-children element in the template; placing the sequence of said instantiated templates in the result tree*



inherently shows inserting the subset style sheets following a root template of the global style sheet; **page 8**: “The xsl: process instruction processes only selected children (or selected nodes from elsewhere in the tree). The xsl: process element has a required select attribute. All of the elements in the source tree that match the pattern specified in the select attribute are processed, and their instantiated templates are inserted into the result tree ...”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses inserting the subset style sheets following a root template of the global style sheet providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for using the template technique for inserting the subset style sheets.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Nielsen discloses identifying a plurality of subset style sheets as mentioned in claim 1, but does not disclose that said identifying includes parsing the electronic document into a document object model and examining first level child elements of the document object model.

Walsh discloses that identifying a plurality of subset style sheets includes parsing the electronic document into a document object model and examining first level child elements of the document object model (**page 2**, last two sentences to **page 3, second paragraph**: the source tree, which is the *tree representation of the parsed XML source document* where each node of the document has a style sheet implies that said style sheets are identified by parsing the electronic document).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen for easily identifying the style sheets of the elements in a document by examining the document object model generated from parsing the document.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Nielsen does not disclose matching values of the first level child elements to characteristic identifier of subset style sheets in a subset style sheet repository and selecting the plurality of subset style sheets from the subset style sheets in the subset style sheet repository based on whether the first child element values match characteristic identifiers for the subset style sheets

Walsh discloses matching values of the first level child elements to characteristic identifier of subset style sheets in a subset style sheet repository and selecting the plurality of subset style sheets from the subset style sheets in the subset style sheet repository based on whether the first child element values match characteristic identifiers for the subset style sheets (**page 8, page 3**: the fact the XSL processor starts at *the root node* until the last child node to process the style sheet templates implies the plurality of style sheets includes a global style sheet, which is the style sheet at the root node, and the other subset style sheets of the children nodes; also, the fact that all of the elements in the source tree that match the pattern specified in the selected attribute are processed, and their instantiated templates are inserted into the result tree shows said matching values).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses the matching values of the child elements that match characteristics for the style sheets of the elements thus motivating to incorporate into Nielsen for obtaining a tool to easily identify the subset style sheet to be merged.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 2, Nielsen does not disclose the global style sheet includes a prefix glue that generates cards from the merged subset style sheet.

Walsh discloses that the global style sheet includes a prefix glue that generates cards from the merged subset style sheet (page 3, What Does XSL Look Like?).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen for effectively generating data from the merged subset style sheet.

Claims 17-23, 30 are for an apparatus of method claims 2-7, 15 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 32-37, 45 are for a computer program product of method claims 2-7, 15 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

11. Claims 8, 24, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen (US Pat No. 5,899,975, 5/4/99, filed 4/3/97).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Nielsen does not disclose explicitly storing the composite style sheet in a composite style sheet repository.

However, Nielsen does teach a style sheet database for storing style sheets (col 4, lines 48-51) and combining the stylesheets in accordance with the rules (col 8, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Nielsen to include storing the composite style sheet in a composite style sheet repository for the following reason. Nielsen discloses the composite style sheet generated by combining the style sheets, and a style sheet database, thus motivating to include a composite style sheet database for storing the generated composite style sheets for future use since it was well known to use a database for storing a specific type of generated data.

Claims 24 and 38 are for an apparatus and a computer program product of method claim 8, and are rejected under the same rationale.

12. Claims 10, 25, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Walsh as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Feibus, Visual InterDev Improves, InformationWeek, September 28, 1998, Iss. 702, pg. 18A, 2 pgs, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-3.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 2, Nielsen and Walsh do not disclose that the global style sheet includes electronic document navigational information.

Feibus discloses that technology from FrontPage 98 allows users to organize the Web documents in their site and automatically update the navigation-bar buttons that you can include as part of each document's style sheet (page 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Feibus into Nielsen and Walsh since Feibus shows that the navigation-bar button data can be included in each document's style sheet providing the advantage to incorporate into Walsh to generate a document with interaction feature by including the navigational data in the document's style sheet.

Claims 25 and 40 are for an apparatus and a computer program product of method claim 10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

13. Claims 11-13, 26-28, 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Boag et al. (US Pat No. 6,589,291 B1, 7/8/03, filed 4/8/99).

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Nielsen does not disclose determining if a client device to which the electronic document is to be sent is capable of rendering the electronic document using the composite style sheet, and sending the electronic document to the client device with a reference to the composite style sheet.

Art Unit: 2178

Boag discloses determining if a client device to which the electronic document is to be sent is capable of rendering the electronic document using the selected style sheet, and sending the electronic document to the client device with a reference to the style sheet (col 3, lines 27-38, col 4, lines 28-36, 42-46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Boag into Nielsen since Boag discloses determining the capability of the client device before sending an electronic document with a selected style sheet and sending the electronic document to the client with a reference to said style sheet providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for reducing the transcoding work at the server as well as reducing the space for storing both the original documents and the transcoded documents at the server where the server has to provide documents involving with style sheets and transformation to the client.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Nielsen does not disclose rendering the electronic document using the composite style sheet and sending the rendered electronic document to the client device, if the client device is not capable of rendering the electronic document using the composite style sheet.

Boag discloses rendering the electronic document using the composite style sheet and sending the rendered electronic document to the client device, if a client device is not capable of rendering the electronic document using the selected style sheet (col 3, lines 27-38, col 4, lines 28-36, 46-49, 55-58).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Boag into Nielsen since Boag discloses determining the capability of the client device before sending an electronic document with a selected style sheet and sending the rendered document to the client using the selected style sheet providing the advantage to include in Walsh for a good way for sending the document to client in case of the inefficiency of the client device by obtaining a completely transcoded document with the selected style sheet at the server before the sending process.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Nielsen discloses that the rendered electronic document is one of an HTML document and a WML document (figure 8, col 7, lines 9-15).

Claims 26-28 are for an apparatus of method claims 11-13, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 41-43 are for a computer program product of method claims 11-13, and are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2178

Applicants argue that Walsh does not disclose identifying and merging of subset style sheets based on the content of a document to generate a composite style sheet (Brief, page 12).

Examiner agrees.

Nielsen discloses the argued features. See the claim rejections above.

### ***Conclusion***

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Motamed (US Pat No. 6,224,048 B1, 5/1/01, filed 1/20/98).

Parks (US Pat No. 6,596,031 B1, 7/22/03, filed 3/13/00).

Chen et al. (US Pat No. 6,507,856 B1, 1/14/03, filed 1/5/99).

Li et al. (US Pat No. 6,799,299 B1, 9/28/04, filed 9/23/99).

Kolfman (US Pat No. 6,912,529 B1, 6/28/05, filed 4/1/98).

Swamy et al. (US Pat No. 6,874,141 B1, 3/29/05, filed 6/29/00).

Elo et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2003/0204814 A1, 10/30/03, filed 9/27/99).

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).



Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Clh  
7/14/05



**STEPHEN HONG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**